

21



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/559,171	04/26/2000	Daniel ManHung Wong	OR00-00801	1509

51067 7590 08/26/2005

ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION  
c/o A. RICHARD PARK  
2820 FIFTH STREET  
DAVIS, CA 95616-2914

EXAMINER

TO, BAOQUOC N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

09/559,171

**Applicant(s)**

WONG ET AL.

**Examiner**

Baoquoc N. To

**Art Unit**

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05/23/2005.  
 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7-11,13-15,17-21,23-25 and 27 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-5, 7-11, 13-15, 17-21, 23-25 and 27 is/are rejected.  
 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claim 1, 11 and 21 are amended in the amendment filed on 05/23/2005. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 13-15, 17-21, 23-25 and 27-33 are pending in this application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1, 11 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims recite "can be", "so that", "that are", "that" and "that is" in claims 1, 11 and 21. Pronouns are not permitted, only what is being referred by "that" should be set forth in the claim. "Can be" renders the claim indefinite by failing to point out what is being performed. Applicants are advised to amend the claim to solve the 112 rejection set forth in claim.

Claims 3-5, 7-10, 13-15, 17-20, 23-25 and 27-33 are rejected under the same reasons as to their based claims.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 05/23/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues "there if nothing within Maier, Elmasri, or Jagadish, either separately or in concert, which suggests creating audit records for only selected rows in relational tables that are accessed by the query and that satisfy an auditing condition,

wherein the auditing condition specifies selecting a row based on a value of a field in the row in the relational database.”

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument. Maier discloses in fig.3 the DDL statement specifying an alteration in the schema of a specific object 200, which is typically a database table, an index, or a partition of a database table or index. The specified object is accessed to read its file label and if the command requires generating a new object 202, the new object 202, the new object is created (col. 6, lines 11-15). The DDL statement is the SQL statement and created record based on the set condition in the SQL statement and this is support by Elmasri discloses an SQL conditions “SELECT BDATE, ADDRESS, FROM EMPLOYEE, WHERE FNAME='John' AND 'MINIT'='B' AND LNAME='Smith' (chapter 8.2.1, page 252, lines 23-25). Therefore, it is obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Maier to include condition statement in order to create record which only satisfy accessed row.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2162

3. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 13-15, 17-21, 23-25 and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maier et al. (US. Patent No. 5,625,185) in view of Elmasri et al. (Fundamentals of Database System) copy right 2000.

Regarding on claims 1, 11 and 21, Maier teaches a method for selectively auditing accesses to a relational database system, comprising:

receiving a query from a client at a database server that processes queries for the relational database system (col. 3, lines 65-66), wherein the query can be a read-only transaction (abstract and col. 6, lines 31-33);

automatically modifying the query prior to processing the query, so that processing the query causes an audit record to be created and recorded only for selected rows in relational tables that are accessed by the query and that satisfy an auditing condition, wherein the auditing condition specifies selecting a row based on a value of a field in the row in the relational database (col. 4, lines 10-12);

processing the query at the database server to produce a query result (co. 4, lines 7-10);

recording the audit record in an audit record table store (col. 4, lines 10-12); and  
returning the query result to the client (col. 6, lines 35-39).

Maier does not explicitly teach conditionally creating the audit record only for rows in relational tables that are actually accessed by the query and that satisfy the auditing condition. However, SQL is known language to use condition as a part of the querying process. For example, Fundamentals of Database systems was author by Elmasri et al., teaches "SELECT BDATE, ADDRESS, FROM EMPLOYEE, WHERE

Art Unit: 2162

FNAM='John' AND 'MINIT'='B' AND LNAME='Smith' (chapter 8.2.1, page 252, lines 23-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Maier to include creating audit record based on the SQL access condition as taught by Elmasri in order to allow the system to process those specific records in the database.

Regarding on claims 3, 13, and 23, Maier teaches the auditing condition is associated with a table in the relational database system (col. 5, lines 18-27).

Regarding on claims 4, 14 and 24, Maier teaches the auditing condition includes a plurality of auditing conditions (col. 8, lines 24-28).

Regarding on claims 5, 15 and 25, Maier teaches the auditing record includes:

a user name for a user making the query (col. 6, line 4);

a time stamp specifying a time of the query (col. 6, lines 1-4); and

a text of the query (col. 6, lines 15-18).

Regarding on claims 7, 17 and 27, Maier teaches auditing is enabled on a table by table basic (col. 5, lines 63-60).

Regarding on claims 8, 18 and 28, Maier teaches auditing record is created while the query result is generated (col. 6, lines 8-18).

Regarding on claims 9, 19 and 29, Maier teaches the auditing record is created after the query result is generated (col. 6, lines 18-30).

Regarding on claims 10, 20 and 30, Maier teaches the auditing condition includes a condition for a field within the relational database system (col. 6, lines 18-30).

Art Unit: 2162

Regarding on claims 31-33, Maier teaches creating the audit record include:

determining if auditing is enabled (col. 8, lines 35-40); and

creating the audit record only if auditing is enable (col. 8, lines 35-40);

**Conclusion**

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baoquoc N. To whose telephone number is at 571-272-4041 or via e-mail BaoquocN.To@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached at 571-272-4107.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:


Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follow:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Baoquoc N. To

August 18, 2005

  
JEAN M. CORRIELUS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER